FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION WASHINGTON, D.C. 20554

IN REPLY REFER TO:

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

CC92-77

September 16, 1994

RECEIVED

SEP 2 2 1994

The Honorable Paul E. Gillmor U.S. House of Representatives 1203 Longworth House Office Building Washington, D.C. 20515

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION OFFICE OF SECRETARY

Dear Congressman Gillmor:

Thank you for your letter on behalf of Alan L. Word, Sheriff, Williams County Sheriff's Office, and Jim Dennis, Executive Director, Corrections Commission of Northwest Ohio, regarding the Commission's Billed Party Preference (BPP) proceeding. On May 19, 1994, the Commission adopted a <u>Further Notice</u> of <u>Proposed Rulemaking</u> in this proceeding. I have enclosed a copy of the <u>Further Notice</u> and press release accompanying it for your information.

The <u>Further Notice</u> sets forth a detailed cost/benefit analysis of BPP. This analysis indicates, based on the available data, that the benefits of BPP to consumers would exceed its costs. The <u>Further Notice</u> seeks comment on this analysis and asks interested parties to supplement the record concerning the costs and benefits of BPP. The <u>Further Notice</u> also invites parties to recommend alternatives to BPP that could produce many of the same benefits at a lower cost.

The <u>Further Notice</u> also explicitly seeks comment on whether correctional facility telephones should be exempt if BPP is adopted. Specifically, the <u>Further Notice</u> seeks additional information on the effectiveness and costs of controlling fraud originating on inmate lines with or without BPP. The <u>Further Notice</u> also seeks comment on a proposal to exempt prison telephones from BPP if the operator service provider adheres to rate ceilings for inmate calling services.

BPP would not preclude prison officials from blocking or limiting inmate calls to specific telephone numbers in order to prevent threatening and harassing calls. Moreover, BPP would not affect the ability of prison officials to limit inmates to collect calling or to program telephone equipment at the prison site to block certain numbers.

No. of Copies rec'd List ABCDE

The Honorable Paul E. Gillmor Page 2

Thank you for your interest in this proceeding. I can assure you that the Commission will carefully examine all of the comments submitted in response to the <u>Further Notice</u>, including additional empirical data regarding the costs and benefits of implementing BPP and the impact of BPP on telephone service from correctional facilities.

Sincerely yours,

Kathleen M.H. Wallman

Chief

Common Carrier Bureau

Enclosures

PAUL E. GILLMOR 5TH DISTRICT, OHIO

203 LONGWORTH HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING WASHINGTON, DC 20515-3505 202-225-6405

TRAVEL AND TOURISM CAUCUS ENVIRONMENTAL AND ENERGY STUDY CONFERENCE RURAL HEALTH CARE CAUCUS

CONGRESSIONAL RURAL CAUCUS

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE

SUBCOMMITTEES:
OVERSIGHT AND INVESTIGATIONS
TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND FINANCE
TRANSPORTATION AND HAZARDOUS
MATERIALS

OHIO REPUBLICAN WHIP

Congress of the United States Souse of Representatives Washington, DC 20515-3505

August 12, 1994

Ms. Judith Harris Director Office of Legislative Affairs Federal Communications Commission 1919 M Street, NW Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Ms. Harris:

Enclosed are two letters which I received from Ohio residents who are concerned about about Common Carrier Docket Number 92-77 affecting Billed Party Preference (BPP).

I would appreciate it if you could informally consider their comments as part of your rule-making procedures.

Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Paul E. Gillmor

Sincerely,

Member of Congress

PEG:jes Enclosure



WILLIAMS COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE

218 West Bryan Street Bryan, Ohio 43506

ALAN L. WORD, SHERIFF

419-636-3151

July 28, 1994

The Honorable Reed E. Hundt, Chairman Federal Communications Commission 1919 M Street, NW Washington, D.C. 20554

しをもこう

Commin (st it t

RE: CC Docket No. 92-77 Opposition to Billed Party Preference

Dear Chairman Hundt:

I am opposed to the application of Billed Party Preference (BPP) at inmate facilities.

We have analyzed the security and administration needs at our facility and have found it to be necessary to route inmate calls for our facility to a single carrier that is equipped to handle inmate calls and with whom we have a contractual relationship. We cannot allow inmates to have open access to the telecommunications network and the freedom to use any carrier they please. BPP will take away our responsibility to coordinate inmate calls through a carrier we know and trust. Instead, inmate calls will be routed to a number of different carriers, none of whom will have any obligation to use and few that will be trained to handle inmate calls. Criminal behavior with the phones will be uncontrollable.

We have also found it necessary to install phone equipment that is specifically designed for inmate calls. This equipment helps prevent fraud, abusive calls, and other criminal activity over the telephone network. Inmate phone providers evolved as a result of such uncontrolled criminal activity. Given the constant budgetary constraints that we are under, we cannot afford to provide this equipment without the help of inmate phone service providers. BPP would also eliminate the revenue stream that finances our inmate phones. If BPP is applied to inmate facilities, there will be no way for us to finance these phones, nor will there be inmate phone service providers to assist us. Without inmate phones, the morale of our inmates will be devastated. The resulting increase in tension will make it more difficult for our staff to manage inmates.

Furthermore, we are sensitive to the rates inmates families pay for calls. We fully appreciate the FCC's concern if some Sheriff or Warden does not take responsibility for protecting inmate families from abusive rates. We do not agree with the FCC that the solution for this lack of responsibility is BPP. The proper and more effective action would be to adopt rate ceilings on inmate calls and then let Sheriffs or Wardens enforce these rate ceilings through their contracts. Indeed we believe the overwhelming majority of Sheriffs and Wardens are committed to requiring rates that are fair and reasonable. BPP is clearly an over reaction. Setting ceilings would be more responsible legislation.

In short, BPP would take away our ability to employ important security and administrative measures that we have found to be necessary at our facility. We urge you not to adopt regulations that interfere with our administrative and security decisions -- decisions that are clearly within our discretion and which we have a public responsibility to make.

Approving such legislation as BPP as currently written will also enable such inmate advocate groups to pursue other legislative agendas that exceed the intent of current case law, prisoner rights as guaranteed by our forefathers in the constitution and would encourage you to ignore what the professionals in the corrections field need to protect the public.

Respectfully submitted,

Williams County Sheriff's Department

Alan L. Word,

Sheriff

ALW/ksh

cc: The Honorable James H. Quello

The Honorable Rachelle B. Chong

The Honorable Andrew C. Barrett

The Honorable Susan Ness

The Honorable Congressman Paul E. Gilmore

The Honorable Senator Howard Metzenbaum

APCC Inmate Phone Service Providers Task Force

Corrections Commission of

Northwest Ohio

03151 Road 24.25 Route 1, Box 100-A Stryker, Ohio 43557 419/428-3800 FAX: 419/428-2119 AUG 200 1884

ALE (18 18)

Deflence County

Executive Committee: Devid Westrick Robert Switzer Joseph Schmenk

Fulton County

Vice Cherman: James Barber Lowell Rupp Darrell Merillat

Henry County

Chairman: John Nye Kenneth Rohrs Richard Bertz

Lucas County

Executive Committee: James Telb Sandy Isenberg Stephen Yarbrough

Toledo

Executive Committee: Carleton Finkbeiner Mary Grace Trimboli Gerald Galvin

Williams County

Secretary:
Robert Wilson
Alan Word
Rosanne Fisher

Executive Director:

July 25, 1994

Congressman Paul Gillmor South Boundry St. Perrysburg, Ohio 43552

RE: CC Docket No. 92-77 Opposition to Billed Party
Preference

Dear Congressman Gillmor:

I am opposed to the application of Billed Party Preference (BPP) at inmate facilities.

I have analyzed the security and administration needs at our facility and have found it to be necessary to route inmate calls from our facility to a single carrier that is equipped to handle inmate calls and with whom we have a contractual relationship. We cannot allow inmates to have open access to the telecommunications network and the freedom to use any carrier they please. BPP will take away our responsibility to coordinate inmate calls through a carrier we know and trust. Instead, inmate calls will be routed to a number of different carriers, none of whom will have any obligation to us and few that will be trained to handle inmate calls. Criminal behavior with the phones will be uncontrollable.

We have also found it necessary to install phone equipment that is specifically designed for inmate calls. This equipment helps prevent fraud, abusive calls, and other criminal activity over the telephone network. Inmate phone providers evolved as a result of such uncontrolled criminal activity. Given the constant budgetary constraints that we are under, we cannot afford to provide this equipment without the help of inmate phone service providers. BPP would also eliminate the revenue stream that finances our inmate phones. If BPP is applied to inmate facilities, there will be no way for us to finance these phones, nor will there be inmate phone service providers to assist us. Without inmate phones,

the morale of our inmates will be devastated. The

Page 2

resulting increase in tension will make it more difficult for our staff to manage inmates.

Furthermore, we are sensitive to the rates inmate families pay for calls. We fully appreciate the FCC's concern if some Sheriff or Warden does not take responsibility for protecting inmate families from abusive rates. We do not agree with the FCC that the solution for this lack of responsibility is BPP. The proper and more effective action would be to adopt rate ceilings on inmate calls and then let Sheriffs or Wardens enforce these rate ceilings through their contracts. Indeed we believe the overwhelming majority of Sheriffs and Wardens are committed to requiring rates that are fair and reasonable. BPP is clearly an over reaction. Setting ceilings would be more responsible legislation.

In short, BPP would take away our ability to employ important security and administrative measures that we have found to be necessary at our facility. We urge you to not adopt regulations that interfere with our administrative and security decisions -- decisions that are clearly within our discretion and which we have a public responsibility to make.

Approving such legislation as BPP as currently written will also enable such inmate advocate groups to pursue other legislative agendas that exceed the intent of current case law, prisoner rights as guaranteed by our forefathers in the constitution and would encourage you to ignore what the professionals in the corrections field need to protect the public.

Respectfully submitted,

CORRECTIONS CENTER OF NORTHWEST OHIO

Jam Bennis

Executive Director

/pa

c:\jd\Inmate.Phn